REMARKS

Claims 1-32, all the claims pending in the application, are rejected. Reconsideration and reexamination of the subject Application are respectfully requested. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1 and 5 are amended to address informalities. No new issues are raised and, consistent with the PTO policy supporting "compact prosecution," the entry of the amendment would place the application in better condition for appeal or further proceedings. Entry is respectfully requested.

Amendments Responsive to Claim Objections

In claim 1 line 13, as well as claim 5 line 16, the examiner assumes "electronically identifiable locations" should be "electronically identifiable physical locations". The Examiner is correct and an appropriate correction has been made. This amendment should not present any new issues, and therefore Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendment after final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (2002/0135515) in view of McCarten et al. (5,959,596), in further view of Kumano (5,978,754). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites the feature of making said language choices accessible by one or more applications so that at least one of said applications can, when operated selectively in said venue, provide output to each respective person in the respective language choice at said respective electronically identifiable physical location in said venue on the basis of a real time translation into said respective language of choice.

On page 11 of the January 28, 2010 Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that neither Rankin nor McCarten teach providing output in a language on the basis of a real time

translation into the respective language of choice. Thus, the Examiner cites Kumano as allegedly curing this deficiency. The rationale for the combination is to more quickly execute processing.

However, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position for the following reasons.

First, both Rankin and McCarten teach only <u>pre-recorded</u> materials, and each suggests that such materials would be pre-recorded in each language and thus not provided on the basis of a real time translation, as recited by claim 1.

McCarten

McCarten teaches that video games and other materials are <u>centrally stored and downloaded</u> to seat display units. (see, e.g., col. 1, lines 34-37, 53-55). McCarten's discussion of languages is limited to col. 4, lines 27-43, in which language functions of McCarten are only schematically described. At this portion, McCarten only indicates that a display menu permits a user to select between various languages, and that this language determines the language used with movies, etc. Col. 4, lines 27-41 indicate that a user selects a mode, a "check is made" to ensure a movie is presented in an appropriate language, and then the "channel is changed" for receipt of the selected movie. This description suggests that the movies are centrally stored in various languages, and that the channel is changed to an appropriate language version of the movie.

Rankin

Rankin similarly teaches that materials are pre-recorded in various languages. At paragraph 0029, Rankin teaches that a transport beacon exchanges data with a base station beacon. The transport beacon <u>receives</u> "data relating to one or more geographical positions," and may include "public address or news announcements in different user-terminal-selectable languages." Paragraph 0029 also describes that this received data is stored at the transport beacon.

Paragraph 0083 further describes this data. Specifically, in normal use, the data is provided for a plurality of geographical positions each of which may be passed by the route taken by the transport platform on which the transport beacon is riding. This description

strongly suggests that any data is pre-recorded and stored for various places along the route and would include pre-recordings in different languages, since the data for many geographical positions that may be passed by is provided at one time.

The description at paragraph 0083 is corroborated by the description at paragraph 0089 which describes a detailed embodiment. Paragraph 0089 describes that the transport beacon 102 receives user profile data 506 for one or more user terminals, and for each user profile, the transport beacon "selects an advertisement 508 from the stored advertisement material 510 and transmits the selected advertisement 512 to the user terminal." (emphasis added).

In the Response to Arguments section at pages 5-6 of the January 28, 2010 Final Office Action, the Examiner maintains the position that there is no evidence in Rankin to support a conclusion that Rankin necessarily depends on pre-recorded public announcements concurrently in several languages. However, the above cited sections of Rankin strongly corroborate Applicant's position that any advertisement data, as well as public address or news, would indeed be pre-stored in different languages.

The Examiner also cites to the teachings at paragraph 0067 of Rankin. At this portion, Rankin indicates that "the above may be personalized in terms of messages sent to individual user terminals, for example to reflect individual language preferences." However, the reference to "the above" refers to the description at paragraphs 0061-0066. Paragraphs 0061-0066 describe advance notification of users of upcoming information on the route of a transportation platform (paragraph 0061). Information material is provided relating to various geographical positions on the present route (paragraph 0062) and information material is provide that is associated with a subsequent geographical position (paragraph 0066). This information would necessarily have to be pre-recorded, and again strongly suggests stored information that would be stored in various languages.

Kumano

Kumano is directed at a translation display apparatus including designated windows on the display. Kumano addresses a problem in which even if a user only wants a few sentences translated, a large number of original sentences in a first language must be input and must be translated into the other language. (col. 1, lines 17-27). Thus, Kumano proposes a system

whereby a user may select only parts of the text using an input device to place and resize a window around the text. (see, col. 4, lines 41-47 and col. 3, lines 52-54). Then, this selected text is translated in real time.

One of Ordinary Skill Would Not Make the Rankin, McCarten, Kumano Combination

Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be prompted to combine the teachings of Rankin and McCarten with Kumano to achieve selectively providing output to each respective person in the respective language choice on the basis of a real time translation into said respective language of choice, as recited in claim 1.

First, Kumano teaches that user selection is <u>required</u> in order for Kumano's system to work. However, assuming for the sake of argument the Examiner's reading of Rankin and McCarten, the advertisement of Rankin would already have been sent to the user in the language of choice. Therefore, no real time translation would be necessary.

Second, as discussed above, Rankin and McCarten both teach pre-storing advertisements and other materials in various languages. Thus, again, the real time translation taught by Kumano would not be necessary.

Third, providing real time translation as taught by Kumano in the system as taught by Rankin and McCarten would slow down the system because the pre-recorded advertisements would have to be translated real-time. Thus, the rationale proposed by the Examiner would be frustrated.

Accordingly, since the Examiner acknowledges that the Rankin and McCarten combination does not teach real time translation as claimed, claim 1 is patentable over the art of record.

Independent Claim 22

Claim 22 recites similar features to claim 1 and is therefore patentable for similar reasons.

Claims 2-5, 7, 9, 11-15, 17-21, 23-26, and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (2002/0135515) in view of McCarten et al. (5,959,596), in further view of Poch (5,152,003), in further view of Kumano (5,978,754). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 2

Claim 2 recites the feature that persons who do not choose a language are assigned a language choice being a principle language. The Examiner acknowledges that Rankin and McCarten do not teach a principle language. The Examiner thus cites Poch as allegedly curing the deficiency.

Poch

However, Poch is directed to a system for use in art exhibits that attempts to address difficulties in providing messages at exhibitions simultaneously in different languages. Thus, Poch proposes a system in which messages are pre-recorded in a plurality of different languages and stored in a storage medium with an identifier. (see claim 1). A transmitter is provided which transmits each message on a separate frequency, with messages of different languages transmitted on different frequencies. A user then selects a receiver wand and can manually select a desired message which is translated in the selected language. (see col. 3, line 54 to col. 4, line 37). Accordingly, contrary to the Examiner's assertion at page 23 of the January 28, 2010 Final Office Action, the user must select a wand of a given language, and is not assigned a principle language.

Accordingly, Poch does not teach any principle language. In Poch, messages in multiple languages are provided. Poch also does not teach assigning a language choice for a person who does not make a choice. In Poch, the users must make a choice.

Kumano is cited for the narrow teaching of real time translation and does not include any relevant teachings related to a principle language or assigning a language to a person who did not choose a language.

Thus, since Poch does not cure the deficiencies of Rankin, McCarten, and Kumano, claim 2 is patentable.

Claim 3

Claim 3 recites features similar to those of claim 2 and is therefore patentable for similar reasons.

Claim 4

Claim 4 depends from claim 1 which has been shown to be patentable over Rankin, McCarten and Kumano above. The Examiner has not cited Poch as teaching any feature of claim 4 and therefore, claim 4 is patentable based on its dependency from claim 1.

Independent Claim 5 & Claims 7, 9, 11-12

Claim 5 recites features similar to claim 2 and therefore patentable for similar reasons.

Claims 7, 9, and 11-12 are patentable based on their respective dependencies.

Independent Claim 13 & Claims 14-15, 17-21

Claim 13 recites features similar to claim 2 and therefore patentable for similar reasons.

Claims 15-14 and 17-21 are patentable based on their respective dependencies.

Claim 23

Claim 23 recites features similar to claim 2 and is therefore patentable for similar reasons.

Claims 24-25

Claims 24-25 each depend from claim 22 which has been shown to be patentable over Rankin, McCarten and Kumano above. The Examiner has not cited Poch as teaching any feature of claims 24-25 and therefore, claims 24-25 are patentable based on its dependency from claim 22.

Independent Claim 26 & Claims 28-31

Claim 26 recites features similar to claim 2 and therefore patentable for similar reasons.

Claims 28-31 are patentable based on their respective dependencies.

Claims 6, 16, 27, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (2002/0135515) in view of McCarten et al. (5,959,596), in further view of Poch (5,152,003), in further view of Kumano (5,978,754), in further view of Li et al. (6,205,418).

This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

With respect to claims 6, 16, and 27, the Examiner admits that Rankin, McCarten, and Poch do not specifically mention making said respective language choices accessible by an attendant so that said attendant can anticipate the language needs of a respective person. The Examiner looks to Li for a disclosure of "making said respective language choices accessible by an attendant so that said attendant can anticipate the language needs of a respective person."

Li is cited solely for the foregoing limited purpose and does not remedy the deficiencies of Rankin alone or in combination with McCarten and Poch. Thus, the claims would be patentable.

With respect to claim 32, the Examiner admits that Rankin, McCarten, and Poch do not specifically mention the system is operable to receive said language choices from an operator who has received the respective language choices from one or more of the passengers. The Examiner looks to Li for a disclosure of a system that "is operable to receive said language choices from an operator who has received the respective language choices **(Abstract)**."

Li is cited solely for the foregoing limited purpose and does not remedy the deficiencies of Rankin alone or in combination with McCarten and Poch. Thus, the claims would be patentable.

Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin, McCarten, Poch, Kumano, and in further view of Glenn. This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

With respect to claims 8 and 10, the Examiner admits that Rankin and McCarten do not specifically mention a prerecorded audio translation in the language choice of a respective person, and look to Poch for a prerecorded audio translation in the language choice of a respective person **(Col 3 lines 65-66, Col 4 lines 31-37),**" and to Glenn for "a message [that] is accessible by means of a headphone or ear-piece output allocated to a respective person,

whereby a respective person can access said personal announcement by means of a headset connected to said output **(Col 3 lines 40-42)," and a** "message [that] comprises a prerecorded text translation of the message in the language choice of a respective person, accessible by means of a display allocated to said respective person, whereby said respective person can read said message on said display **(Fig. 2)."**

Glenn is cited solely for the foregoing limited purpose and does not remedy the deficiencies of Rankin alone or in combination with McCarten and Poch. Thus, the claims would be patentable.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Kevin C. Kunzendorf /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 28, 2010

Kevin C. Kunzendorf
Registration No. 58,308